REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application. The Applicant has amended claims 1, 5, 10, and 14. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner repeated the rejection of claims 1, 4, 10 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Owens, *et al.* (US 2003/0039244). The Applicant has amended the claims to better distinguish the claimed invention from Owens. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

In the Applicant's previous response, it was argued that the claimed invention has a different purpose than Owens. Owens's main objective is to automate the configuration of the DSL modem and eliminate manual configuration tasks previously performed by the end user. Owens still has a conventional DSLAM in the process as well as a conventional Broadband Remote Access Server (BRAS) for configuring the advanced service binding. The Applicant's claimed invention, on the other hand, modifies the DSLAM to provide the advanced service binding (between the IP client and the service). This function was previously performed in the BRAS. Thus, the BRAS is no longer needed for configuration of the service bindings. This eliminates several problems with the BRAS-based service binding procedure, which Owens does not solve.

The Examiner did not give any weight to the Applicant's argument because the claims do not expressly recite that the claimed DSLAM eliminates the need for the BRAS. The Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 5, 10, and 14 to recite that the claimed DSLAM eliminates the need for the BRAS.

Additionally, independent claims 1, 5, 10, and 14 to clarify that the DSLAM is configured to provide the *advanced* service binding corresponding to the requested service. While the basic service binding (between the VLAN in the access network and the PVC on the local DSL loop) has conventionally been provided by the DSLAM (as

stated at the top of page 2 of the Applicant's specification), the advanced service binding (between the IP client and the service) has conventionally been provided by the BRAS. By implementing this functionality in the DSLAM, the need for the BRAS is eliminated.

As noted in the Applicant's previous response, Owens does not disclose or suggest this feature since Owens still has a conventional DSLAM in the process as well as a conventional BRAS for configuring the advanced service binding. Therefore, the withdrawal of the § 102 rejection and the allowance of amended independent claims 1 and 10, and dependent claims 4 and 13 are respectfully requested.

3.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner also repeated the rejection of claims 2, 3, 5-9, 11, 12, and 14-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Owens, et al. (US 2003/0039244) in view of Holmgren, et al. (US 7,277,442). The Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to independent claims 5 and 14 also overcome the obviousness rejection based on Owens and Holmgren.

Like claims 1 and 10 above, independent claims 5 and 14 have been amended to clarify that the DSLAM is configured to provide the advanced service binding corresponding to the requested service, and to recite that the claimed DSLAM eliminates the need for the BRAS. Like Owens, Holmgren does not disclose or suggest such a DSLAM or method. Therefore, the withdrawal of the § 103 rejection and the allowance of amended independent claims 5 and 14 are respectfully requested.

Claims 2-3, 6-9, 11-12, and 15-18 depend from amended base claims 1, 5, 10, and 14, respectively, and recite further limitations in combination with the novel and unobvious elements of the amended base claims. Therefore, the allowance of claims 2-3, 6-9, 11-12, and 15-18 is respectfully requested.

4.) Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-18.

The Applicant requests a telephone interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 20, 2010

Steven W. Smith
Registration No. 36,684

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-1572
steve.xl.smith@ericsson.com